

# **EXHIBIT 1**

Page 1

1 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

2 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

3 Case No. 08-99000-smb

4 Adv. Case No. 09-01182-smb

5 - x

6 In the Matter of:

7

8 BERNARD L. MADOFF INVESTMENT SECURITIES LLC,

9

10 Debtor.

11 - x

12 IRVING H. PICARD, TRUSTEE FOR THE LIQUIDATION OF

13 BERNARD L. MADOFF INVESTMENT SECURITIES LLC,

14 Plaintiff,

15 v.

16 MERKIN ET AL.,

17 Defendants.

18 - x

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 2

1 U.S. Bankruptcy Court  
2 One Bowling Green  
3 New York, NY 10004

5 August 9, 2017

6 | 10:01 AM

18

11

12

1

16

17

21 B E F Q B E :

22 HON. STUART M. BERNSTEIN

23 U. S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

24

25 ECRO: JULIO PESEYRA

Page 3

1      Hearing re:   Trustee's Motion to Exclude the Opinions and  
2      Testimony of Jeffrey M. Weingarten

3

4      Hearing re:   Defendants' Motion to Exclude the Testimony and  
5      Report of Bruce G. Dubinsky

6

7      Hearing re:   Defendants\* Motion to Exclude the Testimony,  
8      Reports, and Declaration of Steve Pomerantz

9

10     Hearing re:   Defendants' Motion to Exclude the Expert  
11     Testimony of Amy B. Hirsch

12

13     Hearing re:   Defendants' Motion to Exclude the Expert  
14     Testimony of Lisa M. Col

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25     Transcribed by:   Sonya Ledanski Hyde

1 A P P E A R A N C E S :

2

3 BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP

4 Attorneys for Trustee, Irving H. Picard Esq.

5 45 Rockefeller Plaza

6 New York, NY 10111

7

8 BY: LAN HOANG

9 DAVID J. SHEEHAN

10 BRIAN W. SONG

11

12 NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT US LLP

13 Attorneys for Defendants Ascot Fund, Receiver of Ascot

14 Partners

15 1301 Avenue of the Americas

16 New York, NY 10109

17

18 BY: JUDITH A. ARCHER

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 5

1 DECHERT LLP

2 Attorneys for Merkin Defendants

3 1095 Avenue of the Americas

4 New York, NY 10036

5

6 BY: ANDREW J. LEVANDER

7 NEIL A. STEINER

8

9 APPEARING TELEPHONICALLY

10 KEVIN H. BELL

11 SEANNA R. BROWN

12 NATHANIEL S. KELLEY

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 7

1 performing or not performing due -- adequate due diligence  
2 or what adequate due diligence is. And I just don't see  
3 that as an issue in the case.

4 MR. LEVANDER: So, Your Honor --

5 THE COURT: And let me explain why. I mean, Mr.  
6 Merkin -- the issue in the case is not whether Mr. Merkin  
7 adequately performed due diligence or was negligent in  
8 performing due diligence or breached a fiduciary duty to  
9 someone else in performing due diligence. It's what he  
10 knew. If he did nothing, like the good faith purchasers in  
11 these cases -- if he did nothing and didn't find out  
12 anything, it just seems to me that's the end of the case.

13 MR. LEVANDER: Your Honor, I don't disagree.

14 THE COURT: Well, you put in a due diligence  
15 report also.

16 MR. LEVANDER: I did. And I'll explain to you why  
17 one could draw a distinction between the two. I could also  
18 understand Your Honor saying that under Rule 702 you're not  
19 going to find what I'm about to say as assisting the Court  
20 in making the decision. But the fundamental, basic truth is  
21 that Mr. Pomerantz's report is relevant to nothing. Willful  
22 blindness is the standard and Your Honor articulated the  
23 issue.

24 THE COURT: So, what's Mr. Weingarten's relevant  
25 --

1                   MR. LEVANDER: So, I do think -- so, unlike Mr.  
2 Pomerantz who kind of dreamt up, you know, after the fact,  
3 the tests that he had performed prior to Madoff's fall, Mr.  
4 Weingarten does focus on -- based on 40 years of experience  
5 including running Goldman Sachs Asset Management and his own  
6 hedge fund, and having done due diligence a gazillion times  
7 and having due diligence done on him a gazillion times, that  
8 what -- he ties his analysis to what actually Mr. Merkin  
9 did. And to the extent he says that is consistent with his  
10 40 years of experience and what people did prior to the  
11 emergence of the Madoff fraud, that does bear, arguably, on  
12 the good faith of Mr. Merkin, which, you know, ties into the  
13 willful blindness standard.

14                   And so, therefore I could draw that distinction.  
15 There's no relevance to the Pomerantz report. I'm going to  
16 live with, you know, the goose and the gander here, though I  
17 do think there is a difference between the goose and the  
18 gander.

19                   THE COURT: All right. I'll deal with Pomerantz's  
20 motion first.

21                   MR. LEVANDER: Okay. I'm not sure how much more I  
22 need to say, but I'll quickly try to -- you know, we had  
23 moved to exclude the report and testimony of --

24                   THE COURT: All right. Going back to Weingarten -  
25 -

1 MR. LEVANDER: Yeah.

2 THE COURT: -- why do I need Weingarten to tell me  
3 what Merkin did? Merkin can testify to what he did, right?

4 MR. LEVANDER: Absolutely. And --

5 THE COURT: So, what do I -- what does Weingarten  
6 do for it?

7 MR. LEVANDER: So, arguably Mr. --

8 THE COURT: Other than tell me what Merkin knew or  
9 didn't know, which I wouldn't let him testify to anyway.

10 MR. LEVANDER: -- no, but what he would testify to  
11 and his report identified is, "Here's the methodology that  
12 in pre-Madoff days, people need to focus on the five P's.  
13 This is the methodology that people did due diligence. And  
14 based on my 40 years of experience and having done this a  
15 lot, I've looked at what Mr. Merkin said he did. I've  
16 looked at what was in Mr. Merkin's due diligence file, and I  
17 find that satisfies what would have been normal due  
18 diligence standards in that period of time."

19 THE COURT: Yeah. But his report goes well beyond  
20 that. He talks about what Merkin knew or didn't know.

21 MR. LEVANDER: Well, he's tying -- what he's  
22 trying to do is to tie the five P analysis to what Merkin  
23 has testified to. His testimony relies on the accuracy of  
24 Mr. Merkin's testimony and if the Court were to do this  
25 probably then obviously the opinion becomes less useful.

1       But to the extent that the Court accepts Mr. Merkin's  
2       testimony, accepts the inferences to be drawn from the due  
3       diligence file, what Mr. Weingarten does is he adds the  
4       gloss that this obviously is the kind of thing that one did  
5       in those days on due diligence and therefore it shows that  
6       Mr. Merkin was acting in good faith.

7           THE COURT: I think you got more out of his report  
8       than I did.

9           MR. LEVANDER: I'm sure I --

10          THE COURT: I guess we're discussing Mr.  
11       Weingarten's report at this point, but --

12          MR. LEVANDER: -- okay. I'm happy to discuss  
13       either, Your Honor.

14          THE COURT: All right. Well, you made the motion  
15       for Pomerantz so I'll hear Pomerantz.

16          MR. LEVANDER: Thank you, Your Honor. As much fun  
17       as it would be to cross-examine Mr. Pomerantz and his  
18       notions, I just think it's a waste of the Court's time and  
19       it will be days of Court's time by the time we're finished  
20       with all the motions you're going to hear today. The only  
21       issue here is the issue of willful blindness. As you have  
22       held, as Judge Rakoff has repeatedly held in the Madoff case  
23       including your summary judgment decision, willful blindness  
24       requires proof that Merkin subjectively believed there was a  
25       high probability that Madoff was engaged in a Ponzi scheme

1                   Your initial instincts are correct. It's  
2 irrelevant. And that's what Judge Rakoff held in the Katz  
3 case.

4                   THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. I'll reserve  
5 decision on Pomerantz. Who's next?

6                   MR. LEVANDER: You want to hear from Weingarten --  
7 on Weingarten as well?

8                   THE COURT: Sure. What do we do on Weingarten? I  
9 have many of the same comments. And frankly, I didn't find  
10 your six-page report particularly probative. Go ahead. Did  
11 I just make your argument?

12                  MS. HOANG: Okay. Again, for the court reporter,  
13 Lan Hoang, Your Honor. (Indiscernible) requires that each  
14 expert that's proffered by a party -- the expert's opinions  
15 be grounded in reliable principles and methodology analyses.  
16 The Trustee submits that Mr. Weingarten should be excluded  
17 because he hasn't done any -- he hasn't espoused any  
18 principles, any methodologies, or any analyses in his six-  
19 page report or even the -- what's repeated in his five-page  
20 rebuttal report. It's the same concepts. And there's the  
21 statement by Mr. Levander that yes, Mr. Weingarten has this  
22 40 years of experience and he did all these things. Well,  
23 yes, an expert could be qualified based on their experience.  
24 But there still needs to be a bridge between that experience  
25 and the bare conclusions that are contained in Mr.

1 Weingarten's expert opinions. And that bridge is whether  
2 he's utilized reliable methodologies and analysis. And I  
3 submit he has not.

4 And so, what the defendants have argued is to say,  
5 "Oh, yes, he has a methodology. It's called the five P's."  
6 Well, the five P's is not a methodology. The five P's is a  
7 framework for doing due diligence. And what it is, is the  
8 how of how you organize what you do. The methodology is the  
9 actual collection of the data, what you do with that data  
10 and what analysis you perform on the data and what that data  
11 reveals, the how do I look at it part of due diligence.

12 So, just if you'll indulge me for a second, I  
13 don't want to be over-simplistic with a real-world analogy,  
14 but I think it's helpful in understanding the difference  
15 between the five P's framework and the methodology. When  
16 you buy a house, you have a home inspection because you  
17 simply just don't rely on what the seller tells you is good  
18 and bad about the house. The home inspector comes in and he  
19 has a checklist of things he has to look at, the electrical,  
20 the plumbing, the roof, the basement. That's the framework.  
21 That's what he -- that's what do I look at.

22 So, from there, then he goes, for example, takes  
23 the electrical. He goes and looks at the electric box and  
24 he wants to determine is that electrical box a fire hazard.  
25 Are there enough breakers in there for the entire house?

Page 29

1 And he goes through the whole house and does analysis. What  
2 appliances are in the kitchen. What is in the living room.  
3 What's in each of the bedrooms? What's being utilized? And  
4 then he does an analysis of whether there's enough breakers  
5 in that box, and he comes to a conclusion.

6 That's the methodology. That's the analysis. The  
7 same goes for the basement. And he'll do the same thing.  
8 He looks at the basement because that's in the framework,  
9 but he does independent analysis. Does the basement flood?  
10 Do I need sump pumps? Do I have enough sump pumps for the  
11 amount of water I see in there? And each of those analyses,  
12 that's what we're talking about methodology and reliable  
13 analysis.

14 So, again, I bring you back to Mr. Weingarten's --  
15 the opinions set forth in his report and even in his  
16 rebuttal report. They're conclusions. The report consists  
17 of a summary of conclusions and a conclusion. There's no  
18 analysis.

19 So, what are his opinions? He said, "It is clear  
20 that the made-up philosophy would be to forego potential  
21 higher profits in order to avoid a risk of loss." This is  
22 at page 3. My apologies, Your Honor. "For example, being  
23 out of the market around highly volatile periods during  
24 which the options would have -- the options expired would be  
25 part of that philosophy."

1                   So, let's ask. It's not in there. How did he  
2 determine that being out of the market around highly  
3 volatile periods during which options expire? At his  
4 deposition, Mr. Weingarten admitted that he looked at two,  
5 maybe three trades and that they were some time in 2004,  
6 maybe 2006, and that he doesn't recall exactly. He may have  
7 written it down but he doesn't have the notes.

8                   So, he looks at two or three trades over the 18-  
9 year investment history of the Merkin funds with BLMIS.  
10 There were 60,000 trades over that period of time. And so,  
11 without identification of those two or three trades, we  
12 can't, and the Court can't, assess how reliable his  
13 methodology is, how reliable his analysis is, in order to  
14 say to accept or reject his conclusion.

15                  The same can be said for page 3 and 4 and he's  
16 talking about the investment philosophy, the -- that Madoff  
17 was utilizing the split-strike conversion strategy but with  
18 added benefits. Mr. Merkin understood that Mr. Madoff had,  
19 by virtue of his long experience and knowledge and ability  
20 to take advantage of both market timing and stock selection  
21 to improve returns over that which would have been generated  
22 by formulae putting on of the trades.

23                  What Mr. Merkin understood is something for Mr.  
24 Merkin to testify to. But how did Mr. Merkin determine the  
25 rest about market timing and stock selection? We don't

Page 31

1 know. He -- there's no methodology. He just says so. So,  
2 there's no bridge between what his experience is, because he  
3 says, "I've seen it," to what his conclusion is that Madoff  
4 was utilizing market timing and stock selection. So, you  
5 have to take his word for it.

6 That's ipse dixits. That's not admissible as  
7 expert -- as a basis for expert testimony under 702.  
8 Another example, page 4 when he's talking about the  
9 performance of the typical split-strike strategy. And when  
10 the market was down, the fund outperformed the overall  
11 market. When the market was up sharply, the fund  
12 underperformed.

13 Well, what analysis did he do on BLMIS vis-à-vis  
14 the market? What periods of time did he review. What were  
15 the returns of BLMIS during those periods? What was the  
16 market doing during those periods? Can he tell from the two  
17 or three trades that he looked at, sometime in 2004,  
18 sometime -- maybe 2006, over the 18-year history of the  
19 investment?

20 There's other conclusions that he puts forth  
21 within his report. Page 5, over the course of my career.  
22 He talks about the Sharpe ratio, that the oft-referred to  
23 Sharpe ratio was relatively high for Madoff, but I counted  
24 many funds with very high Sharpe ratios. Madoff's results  
25 were above IRTS but they were certainly achievable. Well,

1 what did you look at? What other funds? What were their  
2 Sharpe ratios? What --

3 THE COURT: Well, you took his deposition. Did  
4 you ask him any of these questions?

5 MS. HOANG: That -- I need to know based on what's  
6 in his expert opinions. It's not our obligation to expand  
7 on it because he didn't put it in there. The same applies  
8 for -- let me backtrack and just add there that Mr. Merkin -  
9 - there's no evidence that Mr. Merkin performed an analysis  
10 of the Sharpe ratio. So, if you're trying to draw this back  
11 to what Mr. Merkin did or didn't do and what he did was  
12 proper, he didn't do it.

13 So, then we talk about the plausibility rule. And  
14 it says, "Well, this was plausible. The returns were  
15 plausible. It's the smell test." That's what he -- that's  
16 what it is. Well, where -- if it's the smell test, how do  
17 you know that his returns were plausible? Did you do  
18 performance attribution? Did he look at it and determine  
19 whether the performance of the BLMIS returns were consistent  
20 with the split-strike strategy, were consistent with the  
21 split-strike strategy with market timing, with stock  
22 selection? He didn't do it. There's -- it's not in his  
23 opinions. It's not -- he looked at two or three trades.  
24 That's it.

25 So, we're not challenging Mr. Weingarten's

1 conclusions because he has his -- he has on this motion to  
2 exclude his testimony. We're saying, yeah, those are his  
3 conclusions. We're challenging him and moving to exclude  
4 him because he hasn't performed -- he hasn't set forth, and  
5 I submit he hasn't performed any methodology or any analysis  
6 to the Merkin Fund's BLMIS returns, trade conference or  
7 statements, whatever information that was available  
8 contemporaneously to Mr. Merkin and the defendants  
9 throughout their 18-year investment.

10                   Had he done that analysis standing here, we  
11 wouldn't have made this motion, because then, as Your Honor  
12 has said, we would have been left to cross-examine him on  
13 the issues of his credibility. But he hasn't met the  
14 threshold for the submission of expert testimony. What's --  
15 so what's left of his opinion if you take out everything  
16 that he opines to on the market and what happens in the  
17 Merkin and the Madoff investment, take those out. What's he  
18 left -- he's left with statements regarding what Mr. Merkin  
19 believed and what he felt. And we set that forth in the  
20 papers. That's state of mind. That's not for him to  
21 expound on.

22                   The rest is a factual narrative. He's just  
23 providing fact. He's not saying -- providing anything other  
24 than -- he's not providing first-hand testimony. He's not  
25 anxious to be a witness. And to the extent that he refers

1 to the OIG, the particular individual from the SEC or what  
2 other saw or what other saw or what other funds did in the  
3 industry, that's not relevant as to what Mr. Merkin saw.  
4 This is subjective. Your Honor said the first prong is  
5 subjective.

6 And I think with the experts, there -- and  
7 particularly on the bench trial, the Court seems to be  
8 inclined based on the motions in limine we argued last time  
9 to just let it in. And I, as the fact-finder, can make  
10 those determinations. And we don't dispute. We agree with  
11 you that you could. But the parties here have had seven  
12 years of discovery. They -- and expert discovery. We've --  
13 we're on the 15th, 16th, or 17th case management plan. It's  
14 been extended so the parties can complete expert discovery.  
15 There have been no complaints that either party could not  
16 get -- could not or did not have a fair and ample  
17 opportunity to prepare their expert reports or to work with  
18 their expert.

19 So, now it's for the Court to determine in advance  
20 of trial whether Mr. Weingarten and each of the experts has  
21 met the requirements of Rule 702 and Daubert, whether there  
22 is a reliable, verifiable methodology and analysis. And  
23 regardless of the fact that this is a bench trial, this Court  
24 is empowered to act as a gatekeeper.

25 I trust -- if you'd give me just one more minute,

Page 35

1 Your Honor, in -- recently in State of New York v. United  
2 Parcel Service, Judge Katherine Forrest in a bench trial --  
3 it's at 2016 Westlaw 4735368. It's a September 2016  
4 opinion. Judge Forrest in a bench trial considered the  
5 parties' respective motions to strike all the experts. The  
6 plaintiff's experts were excluded, not only because he  
7 lacked qualification but also because he failed to identify  
8 a reliable methodology, failed to clarify a time period  
9 during -- relevant to his analysis, and failed to identify  
10 the data that he analyzed to come to his conclusion.

11 In her opinion in excluding that expert testimony  
12 and preventing the other to go forward, the -- Judge Forrest  
13 said, "The Court's experience as a gatekeeper in this regard  
14 does not, however, mean that the fact a matter may be  
15 charged to the bench signals a free-for-all use of the  
16 expert witnesses. There's an obvious efficiency gains --  
17 there are obvious efficiency gains in precluding testimony  
18 from an individual unqualified to take the stand or one who  
19 is providing testimony that is plainly irrelevant or is  
20 based -- or, if relevant, is based on unreliable methods.  
21 Such testimony is a waste of everyone's time. But the  
22 efficiency is not the sole reason for the Court to make a  
23 pre-trial decision on Daubert motions.

24 "Pre-trial rulings can enhance fairness as well as  
25 efficiency in forming sensible trial adjustments. Pre-trial

1 (indiscernible) are to assess the risk-reward profile of the  
2 case on a real-time basis. If a Court will preclude an  
3 expert, it is generally better to sooner than later, simply  
4 putting fair warning on the value."

5 And I would submit that, in opposite to Dr.  
6 Pomerantz, Mr. Weingarten has not met the requirements of  
7 Rule 702 and he should be exclude from trial.

8 THE COURT: Thank you.

9 MR. LEVANDER: What Mr. Weingarten has testified  
10 to is that in this period of time, methodology of doing due  
11 diligence was the (indiscernible) piece. A --

12 THE COURT: Well, that's what the goals or the  
13 (indiscernible) that you looked into. But the argument is  
14 he didn't say what he did in order to look into it.

15 MR. LEVANDER: No. So, what he did then was --  
16 and Mr. Pomerantz doesn't disagree that that's the  
17 appropriate standard, the five P's, and that he, Mr.  
18 Pomerantz, did it that way himself. And what he said, based  
19 on his 40 years of experience and hundreds of due diligence  
20 examinations, either as the subject of it or doing it, that  
21 the things that Mr. Merkin did satisfied the standards that  
22 then existed with -- or exceeded those standards with regard  
23 to each of the five P's.

24 THE COURT: Is that everything that Merkin did in  
25 Mr. Weingarten's report?

1                   MR. LEVANDER: I don't know the answer to that  
2 question, Your Honor. I think that Mr. Weingarten  
3 definitely knew things that may not be in that report. But  
4 he --

5                   THE COURT: But that's the issue that's being  
6 raised.

7                   MR. LEVANDER: Let me --

8                   THE COURT: That -- you know, that he shouldn't be  
9 able to supplement his report by coming to trial and  
10 expanding it.

11                  MR. LEVANDER: -- no. What -- you know, what she  
12 complained about, for example, was he said there were lots  
13 of managers who did better than Madoff and that the returns  
14 were plausible, and therefore when Mr. Merkin believed that,  
15 that's consistent with his 40 years and his knowledge. She  
16 deposed him on it. Give me some managers. And he gave  
17 names of those managers.

18                  That's what they're supposed to do. If they  
19 didn't like the report, they shouldn't have taken his  
20 deposition and waited a year and then said, "Oh, gee, we  
21 don't know." And if the standard is the one they've just  
22 laid out for you, Mr. Pomerantz testified that he looked at  
23 less than 10 of the confirmations out of the thousands of  
24 confirmations and he can't remember which ones. So, that's  
25 our problem. And then Mr. Pomerantz goes, too. What's good

1 for the goose is good for the gander.

2 But the point here is that what Mr. -- his  
3 expertise is, is that it didn't -- you didn't have all these  
4 mathematical tests. You actually asked questions consistent  
5 with the questionnaire, a document that Mr. Pomerantz relied  
6 on that Mr. Weingarten was familiar with, that that has  
7 questions. And those questions are tied into the six -- the  
8 five P's. And Mr. Merkin assiduously tried to get answers  
9 to those five P's. And he did his homework in the way that  
10 it was done in those times.

11 Now, you know, the fact that there isn't a -- you  
12 know, a mathematical calculation about that but it was, you  
13 know, interfaced, but, you know, Mr. Merkin, the testimony  
14 will show, brought in lots of sophisticated investors to  
15 meet with Madoff and they asked the same kind of questions.  
16 They had the same kind of due diligence. And they were  
17 sophisticated people, too, people from, you know, the best  
18 firms on Wall Street, banks, and you'll hear all about that.

19 It seems to me that Mr. Weingarten's testimony  
20 clearly satisfies Rule 26, clearly satisfies 702, and Your  
21 Honor has to make a decision as to whether or not you want  
22 to hear about all kinds of mathematical charts and the  
23 cross-examination on those charts that's not relevant.  
24 That's the Pomerantz issue.

25 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

1                   MS. HOANG: Your Honor, if I can just have a few  
2 minutes, very quickly. A lot of what Mr. Levander said is -  
3 - are disputed facts. Those facts will be before Your Honor  
4 whether through Mr. Merkin or through other witnesses in  
5 this case, and that's for Your Honor to decide. As to what  
6 his -- what he said about the deposition, I could -- I did  
7 ask him about the managers and he named off a few, but it's  
8 not my duty -- job to further expand on what is in his  
9 report or what is not in his report, and Your Honor, I  
10 direct your attention to those reports and the documents.  
11 Consider there is no managers listed. There's nothing in  
12 there. It's not my job to do what he -- they should have  
13 done consistent with Rule 702.

14                   And then, just to address one last point, they  
15 keep ask -- saying that, you know, Mr. -- or that the  
16 standards at the time didn't require you to do the  
17 quantitative analysis that's set forth, the different types  
18 of tools that are set forth in Dr. Pomerantz's report.  
19 Well, they did. As -- they did because they were available.  
20 You see that from the (indiscernible) document in 1995.

21                   In 1996, '97, there were AIMA standards. And the  
22 questions in the AIMA standards don't -- excuse me -- don't  
23 specifically lay out all of those tools. But as Dr.  
24 Pomerantz responded to during his deposition on a pointed  
25 question regarding, "well, where is it in the AIMA," he

Page 40

1 responded that, "Well, it's not identified specifically, but  
2 to get to each of those answers to the topics that are  
3 raised in there, you have to perform quantitative analysis."

4 It talks about draw-down. You have to perform  
5 quantitative analysis based on what you know the returns are  
6 on the fund to figure out if -- how much money that the fund  
7 was down during particular months. He said -- I mean -- if  
8 you -- I'm sorry -- that he goes through the AIMA  
9 questionnaire and says, "Yeah, for each of these you have to  
10 perform quantitative analysis."

11 So, I don't think it's correct to keep repeating  
12 that, well, the AIMA standards -- in 1997 they didn't  
13 require you to do quantitative analysis. You see it in the  
14 (indiscernible) document in 1995 that was available and that  
15 people were doing it, that Mr. Merkin had it in his  
16 possession.

17 THE COURT: I reserve decision on this one. I  
18 have a serious question about the relevance of virtually all  
19 of this due diligence testimony for the reasons I've stated,  
20 but I'll consider it in connection with both experts.

21 MR. LEVANDER: Can I have a one-sentence --

22 THE COURT: One sentence.

23 MR. LEVANDER: -- one sentence. How is it  
24 possible that he can be qualified as an expert when he says  
25 that it's not in the AIMA report and he didn't do it at that

Page 81

1 C E R T I F I C A T I O N

2

3 I, Sonya Ledanski Hyde, certified that the foregoing  
4 transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

5

6

7

8 Sonya Ledanski Hyde

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 Veritext Legal Solutions

21 330 Old Country Road

22 Suite 300

23 Mineola, NY 11501

24

25 Date: August 11, 2016